

May 14, 2007

**City of Milton-Freewater
City Council Minutes**

The Council of the City of Milton-Freewater met in a special work session Monday, May 14, 2007 at 4:00 p.m. in the office of the City Manager of City Hall.

The following members were present: Mayor Lewis Key, Councilors Orrin Lyon, Ed Chesnut, Keith Woods, Debbie Kelley, Steve Irving and Brad Humbert. Staff member present was City Manager Delphine Palmer.

There were no citizens or press in attendance at the work session.

City Manager Delphine Palmer presented a draft job description for the position of city manager for the Council to review and discuss. Ms. Palmer will work directly on the recruitment to save the City approximately \$30,000 in executive recruitment fees.

There being no further discussion, the special work session adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

The Council of the City of Milton-Freewater met in regular session Monday, May 14, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. in the Albee Room of the Library.

The following members were present: Mayor Lewis Key, Councilors Orrin Lyon, Ed Chesnut, Keith Woods, Debbie Kelley, Steve Irving and Brad Humbert.

Staff members present were City Manager Delphine Palmer, Assistant City Manager Linda Hall, Finance Director Dave Richmond, Public Works Superintendent Dave Bradshaw and City Planner Gina Hartzheim.

Citizens present were Merle Sherman, Paul Seaquist, Jon McFarland, Jennifer Riley and Nathan Lyon.

Press member present was Melanie Hall of the Valley Herald.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS: The consent calendar items consisted of minutes from the April 23, 2007 city council meeting. Councilor Chesnut motioned to adopt the consent calendar items. Councilor Kelley seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

REQUEST CHAMBER OF COMMERCE TO HOST BEER GARDEN AT MUDDY FROGWATER FESTIVAL. Jon McFarland, Executive Director MF Area Chamber of Commerce, stated he was before the Council to establish a second year for a beer garden at the Muddy Frogwater Festival. Last year it was stipulated to keep the garden out from the main traffic and that the garden be as inconspicuous as possible; that the operation of the beer garden be conducted professionally, but provide a service for the public. If approved, the Chamber would again stay within these guidelines. There have already been some changes as last year there was some trouble with the beer trailer because of the heat and it cost the Chamber about half of their profits in lost time and beer that had to be poured out because of excessive foam. This year it is thought to go strictly to canned or bottled beer.

Also, there is a different vendor wagon. Instead of using a large, refrigerated trailer from one of the beer companies, the Chamber will use an attractive, A-frame, vendor wagon.

Councilor Woods asked if it would continue to be in the food court. Mr. McFarland said this is where it was last year, but he would like to have it hidden behind the stage by the river. Councilor Chesnut asked for clarification as to exactly where the beer garden would be located. Mr. McFarland said that behind the stage, the walk-way is blocked off by those controlling the sound systems. By placing the beer garden by the river, behind the stage, people would not be walking through this area because of the aforementioned blockage, and instead would have to walk around and behind the stage. Councilor Kelley asked for more clarification asking if the beer garden was planned to be set up by the booths. Mr. McFarland said yes, the booths would be closer than last year, but the beer garden would not be in the middle of the booths. Mr. McFarland said he could set-up the beer garden where it was last year. Councilor Chesnut asked about the traffic pattern going out around the stage opposed to the creek side. Mr. McFarland said the traffic pattern goes between the stage and the restrooms, but he supposed people could walk on the creek side. Councilor Chesnut said he did not want an attractive nuisance that would encourage another traffic pattern. Mr. McFarland said this area could be blocked off.

Councilor Irving asked if there were any incidents last year associated with the beer garden. Were the police called? Mr. McFarland stated there were none.

Councilor Kelley said that when this issue was discussed last year, it was the first time that the Council allowed the event and it was understood that it did not matter if the beer garden were located in a high-traffic area; that if people wanted a cold beer, they would find the beer garden.

Paul Seaquist, 834 College Street, stated he opposed the beer garden for two reasons. One, allowing the consumption of alcoholic beverages on city property. Two, we are sending a bad message to the children of this community as this is a family function, and if the beer garden is now placed by the lemonade and ice cream stand there will be more children and youth in this area than if the beer garden were located on the 18th hole of the golf course.

Merle Sherman, 716 Pierce, asked if smoking would be allowed in the beer garden. Mr. McFarland stated yes, smoking is allowed in the park. Mr. Sherman said that the wind would drift cigarette smoke throughout all the booths.

Councilor Humbert stated he would take the same position he took last year as the beer garden is not located far enough from the activities where the children are. There are plenty of establishments in the community that offer alcoholic beverages and for this one weekend, we can do without it.

Councilor Lyon stated he did not feel it was necessary based on the event being a family event, and would like to keep it that way.

Councilor Chesnut stated he volunteered working on the corn roast for many years, and said he partook of the beer garden last year. He further said he did not find the beer garden to be a problem, but was slightly uncomfortable with the location change as what worked

last year seems best. Councilor Chesnut asked if the beer garden operated on Sunday. Mr. McFarland said it did not. Only Friday and Saturday at specified hours.

Councilor Woods said he was more comfortable with the beer garden located where it was last year, and not by the stage. The consumption of alcoholic beverages has taken place on public property, i.e. the community building and the Albee room of the library.

Councilor Kelley said she thought the whole concept of the beer garden was to have several kinds of beer on tap. Serving from cans and bottles takes away from the concept. Other events not only have several kinds of beer on tap, they have specialty beers that can certainly come from our own area along with hard cider. She said she was curious why it was decided to change to cans or bottles. Councilor Kelley said she understands that there was a problem keeping the beer cold, but also stated she had been to several places where they did not have any problems keeping the beer cold. Mr. McFarland stated that last year there was a combination of cans, bottles and tap. He further said there were electricity problems last year that contributed to extra costs.

Councilor Chesnut motioned to approve the request if the location of the beer garden is located in the same place as last year, and the hours only on Friday and Saturday. Councilor Woods seconded the motion. The motion failed with Councilors Humbert, Irving, Kelley and Lyon in opposition, and Councilors Woods and Chesnut in support.

PUBLIC HEARING/FINDINGS OF FACTS AND ORDINANCE NO. 942
ANNEXATION OF CITY-OWNED DPROPERTY LOCATED EAST OF KEY BLVD.
Mayor Key opened the hearing and summarized the rules for Public Hearing.

No ex parte contact was declared.

Mayor Key asked if notice of hearing had been published according to law. Assistant City Manager Linda Hall stated that this had been done. Mayor Key then asked if there had been any written comments. Ms. Hall stated there was one letter dated May 14, 2007 from Tamra Mabbott, Planning Director of Umatilla County. The letter is generally in support of the annexation, however raises good points that City Planner Gina Hartzheim will address in the staff report.

City Planner Gina Hartzheim stated the Council will be considering two separate annexation requests and both are generally in the same area. Ms. Hartzheim showed aerial photos to the Council depicting the subject property. Ms. Hartzheim further said the proposal would include the Key Boulevard right-of-way in the annexation and Umatilla County staff also recommends the annexation of the Nichols Canyon right-of-way as this is an important step to maintain political boundaries and for consistency in the land-use pattern. If the Council were to decide not to include the Nichols Canyon right-of-way, there would be a small area remaining under Umatilla County jurisdiction for police and fire. Ms. Hartzheim stated that the annexation would only maintain political boundaries, but Umatilla County would still be responsible to maintain the roadway at this point.

The business front property was acquired by the City in conjunction with the Sykes development. At the time of the development, the properties annexed into the City were

the Sykes' properties along Sykes Boulevard, which was the only development proposal considered at that time. Now the City is pursuing annexation of the remaining business property and the adjacent Key Boulevard so that the annexation requests received of property to the south is entirely contiguous to the City boundary.

The potential budget implications are land that will be included into the City that may potentially see the need for City services, but would be minimal, and there is no proposal for the property at this time.

Staff recommends to complete the public hearing, adopt findings of fact supporting annexation, and adoption of the ordinance that include the Nichols Canyon right-of-way.

Ms. Hartzheim stated that to be in state compliance for annexation procedures and a land-use hearing, she would establish an annexation request that is in conformance with the City's confluence of the plan and will meet state-wide goals. With regard to state statutes there are procedures that allow annexations to proceed without requiring a vote of the people if the City's charter so indicates, and if the consent of the property owners have been received. Since this is a city-owned parcel, it is believed the consent is in place. The City's charter does not require an annexation to be submitted to the voters. With regard to comprehensive plan goals, public facilities is probably one of the main goals that may apply to this annexation, mainly water and sewer capabilities and the ability to serve the development of the proposed annexation. There is not a proposal for development at this time, but the sewer and water facilities are both established and located within our urban growth boundary and is sufficient to provide service to any development that may occur. The second goal is the urbanization goal, which again, mainly deals with water and sewer capabilities of the City and the requirements typical of development such as paving streets, water and sewer systems extended to the property and all of these are required once there is a development proposed within the city limits. Last, there is a requirement that basically divides our urban growth area into three separate areas. There is a requirement that a development needs to occur in at least fifty-percent (50%) of the land in two of the three segments once development has occurred. There are three segments that are to the south of the city limits then west and slightly north and then to the east of the Walla Walla River. At this point all of the City's developments and annexations have occurred in two of the three segments, the third being east of the Walla Walla River which development has not occurred at this point. The request is the development of two of the three segments, so compliance in this regard is met.

Mayor Key invited those in support of the annexation to address the Council. There were none.

Mayor Key then invited those in opposition of the annexation to address the Council. There were none.

Councilor Humbert asked if Umatilla County had committed in writing their responsibility of the road. Ms. Hartzheim said they had and the document would be entered into the record.

Councilor Lyon asked for clarification with regard to the shovel-ready property and where this was located. Ms. Hartzheim said the shovel-ready property was south of the proposed annexation, that the westerly portion generally with the business park zone and the easterly portion with a general mix, residential zone.

Councilor Woods asked how much of the nine acres is used for the storm water holding pond. Public Works Superintendent Dave Bradshaw stated approximately one acre.

Mayor Key declared the hearing closed.

Councilor Kelley motioned to adopt findings of fact supporting annexation of city-owned property. Councilor Humbert seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Councilor Kelley moved Ordinance No. 942, be introduced by title only and full reading waived. Councilor Woods seconded and a roll call vote was taken: Councilor Lyon, yea, Councilor Chesnut, yea, Councilor Woods, yea, Councilor Kelley, yea, Councilor Irving, yea and Councilor Humbert, yea. Motion carried unanimously. The City Manager then read the ordinance by title only. Councilor Kelley moved for second reading of Ordinance No. 942 be by title only and full reading waived. Councilor Woods seconded and the motion carried unanimously. The City Manager read the ordinance by title only. Councilor Kelley moved to adopt Ordinance No. 942. Councilor Woods seconded and a roll call vote was taken: Councilor Lyon, yea, Councilor Chesnut, yea, Councilor Woods, yea, Councilor Kelley, yea, Councilor Irving, yea, and Councilor Humbert, yea.

PUBLIC HEARING/FINDINGS OF FACTS AND ORDINANCE NO. 943
ANNEXATION OF SOUTH HILL PROPERTY LOCATED SE OF KEY BLVD.

Council President Kelley opened the hearing and summarized the rules for Public Hearing.

No ex parte contact was declared.

Council President Kelley asked if notice of hearing had been published according to law. Assistant City Manager Linda Hall stated that this had been done. Council President Kelley then asked if there had been any written comments. Ms. Hall stated there is a letter from Tamra Mabbott, Planning Director of Umatilla County dated May 14, 2007 which is for this hearing as well and is generally in favor of the annexation.

City Planner Gina Hartzheim stated that the comments from Umatilla County recommended Nichols Canyon Road abutting the subject area be included in the annexation area. Other comments from the County relates to a portion of property between the original proposal and Nichols Canyon Road which is basically a steep bluff and is unusable land, but would have created an island area. The request will include this entire area.

As with the prior hearing, water and sewer capabilities are adequate. With regard to budget implications, approximately 13 acres will be added to the City which would generate a minimal impact due to services necessary to serve the property, but as development occurs the City would realize a positive budget impact.

Staffs recommendation is to adopt the findings of fact supporting annexation with the legal description that includes Nichols Canyon Road right-of-way and proceed with ordinance adoption.

For the applicable state law and comprehensive plan policy, Ms. Hartzheim said she would include into the record her testimony from the previous hearing, but would add Goal 10 which relates to housing and this piece is planned for residential mix use. The second policy that applies with regard to housing is residential densities that are available under any particular residential zoning. Any development proposal would need to be in conformance.

The City has consent of the sole property owners and staff recommends annexing the subject property including the Nichols Canyon right-of-way. Council President Kelley invited the applicant to address the Council. Applicant was not in attendance.

Council President Kelley invited those in support of the annexation to address the Council. There were none.

Council President Kelley then invited those in opposition of the annexation to address the Council. There were none.

Councilor Chesnut asked if the written document from the County would be entered into record showing their responsibility for the road. Ms. Hartzheim said this would be done.

Council President Kelley declared the hearing closed.

Councilor Woods motioned to adopt findings of fact supporting annexation of property approximately thirteen acres located southeast of Key Boulevard. Councilor Humbert seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Councilor Chesnut moved Ordinance No. 943, be introduced by title only and full reading waived. Councilor Lyon seconded and a roll call vote was taken: Councilor Lyon, yea, Councilor Chesnut, yea, Councilor Woods, yea, Councilor Kelley, yea, Councilor Irving, yea and Councilor Humbert, yea. Motion carried unanimously. The City Manager then read the ordinance by title only. Councilor Humbert moved for second reading of Ordinance No. 943 be by title only and full reading waived. Councilor Woods seconded and the motion carried unanimously. The City Manager read the ordinance by title only. Councilor Woods moved to adopt Ordinance No. 943. Councilor Chesnut seconded and a roll call vote was taken: Councilor Lyon, yea, Councilor Chesnut, yea, Councilor Woods, yea, Councilor Kelley, yea, Councilor Irving, yea, and Councilor Humbert, yea.

RESOLUTION NO. 2042 AMEND AQUATIC CENTER EMPLOYEE PAY PLAN.

Public Works Superintendent Dave Bradshaw stated this issue was brought before the Council to propose pay increases for lifeguards and other staff at the aquatic center. The reason for the proposed increase is the Oregon State minimum wage increase to \$7.80 per hour. The other reason is that the minimum wage is nearing the lifeguard wage. The increase would make the City more competitive during recruitment for staff.

The budget impact would be minimal and was figured at less than three percent (3%). Staff recommends increasing aquatic center wages as per the proposal.

Councilor Woods asked if staff budgeted for the minimum wage increase. Mr. Bradshaw said this was done. Councilor Woods said he noticed the manager's wage scale is stagnant. Mr. Bradshaw stated that Ms. Jennifer Riley did not see the need for management to increase their wage scale. Assistant City Manager Linda Hall stated that the increase was offered to Ms. Riley and she declined. Councilor Kelley asked Ms. Riley if this increase would increase applicants. Ms. Riley said the aquatic center recruitment was difficult as there is a need throughout Umatilla County and the City of Walla Walla for lifeguards even though the City of Walla Walla is not operating their pool. People are not taking the class, maybe due to cost as the class is \$175. Ms. Riley said she was now certified to teach lifeguards and will be teaching a class this summer at our pool. Swim Team will begin again this year as well. Some guards at Walla Walla College are paid \$10 per hour and currently the City has not received enough qualified applicants to fill all of the open position.

Councilor Chesnut motioned to adopt Resolution No. 2042 Amending the Employee Pay Plan by adjusting concession/cashier wage from \$750 per hour to \$7.80 per hour, and modify lifeguard titles and wage from full-time lifeguard, part-time lifeguard and substitute lifeguard to Lifeguard at \$8.30 per hour. Councilor Kelley seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 2043 ESTABLISH RATES FOR AQUATIC CENTER. Public Works Superintendent Dave Bradshaw stated the proposal was to change the session rate at the aquatic center. Split sessions are necessary to keep water quality, but it is proposed to establish the rate of \$4.50 for an all-day pass for adults and the rate of \$3.00 for youth. It is believed this may promote revenues, but there have also been several complaints about paying separately for both sessions.

Councilor Humbert asked for clarification; that when patrons pay for the first session they will have to leave in between sessions, but they will have something that identifies them so they can return at no charge for the second session. Mr. Bradshaw stated this was correct.

Councilor Woods stated he did not believe the rate of \$4.50 was quite reasonable if a patron should choose to only attend one session. Councilor Kelley said she thought a patron could pay \$4.50 for the entire day, but if they chose to attend session I, the rate would be \$3.75 and session II the rate would be \$2.50, all for an adult. Mr. Bradshaw said this was not correct, the proposal is to establish the rate of \$4.50 for either session, or for both sessions in any one day. Councilor Woods said he would rather have the three options; he would like to have patrons pay \$4.50 for both sessions, or pay a rate of \$3.75 for the afternoon and \$2.50 for the evening (all adult rates). Assistant City Manager Linda Hall said this would effectively eliminate the proposal for increase.

Ms. Hall continued saying that when the aquatic center went to the voters as a general obligation bond, one of the promises made to the voters was that the aquatic center would pay for itself. This has proved to be most difficult and Ms. Hall applauded Mr. Bradshaw

and Ms. Riley for their efforts to make it work. Ms. Hall then suggested to the Council that if they were uncomfortable with the proposal, that they may agree to a trial period of one month. Mr. Bradshaw suggested trying the proposal for a month or keeping the current rate system. Mr. Bradshaw further said that chemicals have more than doubled in cost, but this cost is not reflected in rate increases. Ms. Hall said with an aging pool, a higher maintenance cost is required.

Ms. Jennifer Riley, 214 SE 12th Avenue, Pool Manager for our Aquatic Center, stated the pricing simplifies the process for pool staff if there is a single price for all day. Ms. Riley then said that many facilities charge one price regardless of when you arrive. She mentioned Disneyland stating that regardless of whether you arrive first thing or arrive a couple hours before they close, the admission price is the same. When the pool first opened before split sessions, there was one price regardless of when a patron arrived. The proposal is the same idea. The rate is for entry into the pool for the day regardless of arrival time.

Ms. Riley also said there were several comments as to how reasonable our rates are for the pool. If you are a parent using the pool for your daycare, which a lot of people do, it is very reasonable. The aquatic center will gain a small amount of revenue because of families that come in the evening. Many families purchase season passes, so it would not impact these families.

Councilor Woods asked if most people using season passes are outside the city limits. Ms. Riley said most were inside the city limits, but more season passes are purchased from outside the city limit patrons, especially the Walla Walla area. Day passes are usually purchased by out-of-town patrons. Mr. Riley mentioned a woman from Tri-cities area who used the center a lot, and she purchased day passes.

Councilor Irving asked if there was any consideration of separation of non-residence on swim lessons. Ms. Riley said no, but that they had looked at several ideas and options. Councilor Irving asked if they signed up for swim lessons, if patrons had to purchase a season pass. Mr. Riley said no, that was swim team. Councilor Irving suggested an extra \$5 under swim lessons for a total of \$30 for a non-resident patron.

Merle Sherman, 716 Pierce, asked if the proposal was for a youth pass or adult pass. Mr. Bradshaw said both passes. Mr. Sherman then asked if the rates would be raised for someone who only wanted to watch their grandkids swim. Ms. Riley and Mr. Bradshaw both said that in one of the proposals, there was a senior rate. Mr. Sherman asked if he could pay a reduced rate if he wanted to watch his grandkids swim. Ms. Riley said the rate was the same for all adults as staff is responsible for everyone on the deck.

Councilor Kelley moved to adopt Resolution No. 2043 establishing rates for the daily fees as outlined for the Aquatic Center with the inclusion of a \$30 rate for swim lesson for non-resident patrons. Councilor Humbert seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 2044 DECLARING PROPERTY TO BE SURPLUS. Public Works Superintendent Dave Bradshaw stated this surplus comes from tree trimmings and also the

removal of trees on city property and recommended the Council declare this as surplus so as to submit for bids.

Mayor Key asked how large the black walnut was. Mr. Bradshaw stated two to three foot in diameter and maybe thirty feet long.

Councilor Kelley moved to adopt Resolution No. 2044 declaring the list labeled as "Exhibit A" as surplus and authorize the Public Works Department to liquidate as outlined. Councilor Humbert seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 2045 WRITING OFF UNCOLLECTIBLE DEBTS. Finance Director Dave Richmond stated that annually the finance department seeks authorization to write off debts that have been with the collection bureau over one year without commitment to pay, and also for cases of bankruptcy. This action pleases the auditors and the proposed amount this year to write off is \$31,045.55. Unless the amount represents a death or bankruptcy, there is still a chance to recover debt, especially if a person would like to get back on city utilities.

Councilor Irving asked if liens had been placed on property for debt from the deceased. Mr. Richmond said Judge Sam Tucker is good about obtaining funds to pay debts from the deceased, but it is difficult.

Councilor Kelley motioned to adopt Resolution No. 2045 authorizing the Finance Department to write off uncollectible debts. Councilor Humbert seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 2046 TRANSFERRING FUNDS DUE TO UNANTICIPATED REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES. Finance Director Dave Richmond stated there were unforeseen circumstances during the current fiscal year. The finance department absorbs all of the credit card fees and this year's two percent (2%) fee is \$15,500 for the \$600,000 taken in via the internet and over-the-counter credit card payments. The program has been phenomenally successful and there have been many positive responses. Also, new carpet in the finance area paid by the finance department incurred a debt of \$5,500. A debt of \$9,000 for water usage for the leaking pool was incurred, \$8,000 in public buildings due to the rest of the new carpet in city hall and some remodel expense at the golf course club house, \$13,500 for additional unemployment expense, \$20,000 for transportation improvement projects, which were not budgeted, and additional expenses in the library were for books, employee benefits, communication, and furniture and fixtures. There was a bonded debt of \$476 interest with the aquatic center, and the solid waste fund incurred \$9,000 professional service due to rising fuel costs for digging cells at the landfill and the increase cost of DEQ (Department of Environmental Quality) and EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) environmental testing.

Councilor Kelley motioned to adopt Resolution No. 2046 transferring funds due to unforeseen expenditures and revenues. Councilor Irving seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mayor Key then announced this was the opportunity for citizens to approach the Council with issues not on this agenda.

Merle Sherman, 716 Pierce, stated he received an email asking everyone not to purchase gas on Tuesday, May 16th, that it is said that the one day of not purchasing gas will make a big difference. Mr. Sherman said this was done in 1997 and the price of fuel dropped \$0.30 cents.

Mr. Sherman further asked when the city was going to do something with the property behind city hall on Columbia Street. Mr. Bradshaw said that public works crews were trying to maintain the property, but had not demolished the house. Mr. Bradshaw said it was suggested to have some testing done for asbestos.

MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Delphine Palmer said the weed abatement letters will be mailed soon. Project Manager Howard Moss is working on a program for sidewalk repair. Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Moss to give a short report at the next meeting. Councilor Woods requested that when the letters for the weed abatement are written, that they include the value of receiving a 300-gallon garbage receptacle.

Public Works Superintendent Dave Bradshaw said he had received the contract back from the attorney for the restaurant at the golf course. Mr. Bradshaw briefly went over some of the contract language that allows for equipment Chris Dirks has to purchase, reducing the rental rate through the winter months, and to pay for solid waste receptacles.

Councilor Irving motioned to authorize the City Manager to enter into a contract with Chris Dirks to manage the restaurant on the golf course. Councilor Kelley seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilor Irving stated that as a transplant recipient, he speaks for the Oregon Donor Program, which has gone through a transition and is now Donate Life Northwest. This organization has established a new program in conjunction with Donate Life USA. To be a donor on your drivers license is still good and valid, but the "D" on your license means you are a donor intent, which means your demise is the responsibility of your family, which is quite a burden for those in grief. The organization has gone to an online registration, which means you are a first-person consent. If you would like to take this step, **Google™** Donate Life Northwest and register yourself as a donor and this will enable you to be first-person intent when the untimely time comes and will take the responsibility away from family directly after they have been notified.

Councilor Humbert asked Public Works Superintendent Dave Bradshaw who the responsible party is for the ditch that runs by his own home. Mr. Bradshaw stated that technically, the ditch is still the responsibility of the property owner because it is still the right-of-way, but it is City staff's intent to clean this ditch. Councilor Humbert said he was the last residence on the ditch and therefore becomes the catch basin for all the above.

Councilor Humbert asked if he could shovel all of his sediment towards the bridge and then coordinate with public work crews to remove the debris. Mr. Bradshaw said there were tall weeds there. Councilor Humbert said he had just sprayed for these weeds. Mr. Bradshaw said public work crews usually work the Nichols Canyon drainage ditch in June or July after the spring runoff.

Councilor Kelley announced the third community forum to be held Thursday, May 31st at the Walla Walla Community College community area. Information was in the newspaper on Sunday and will be in the next two Sunday newspapers as well.

Councilor Chesnut announced there had been presentations by the City planning and County planning department reviewing the existing zoning along Highway 11 and this next meeting will review how the land is actually used as opposed to how the land is zoned. The next meeting is Thursday, May 24th at 6:00 p.m. here. Councilor Woods said he thought it interesting that the large parcel of land the County changed the zoning to accommodate the large box store, was not changed from agriculture to commercial, but from industrial to commercial.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Lewis S. Key, Mayor